

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

A response to an Office action mailed December 16, 2004 as filed on March 10, 2005.

However, the response that was filed does not present the claim amendments in proper form. In addition, a Terminal Disclaimer was inadvertently omitted.

The instant response is filed herewith to correct the above-noted defects in the earlier-filed response. A Terminal Disclaimer is submitted herewith to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

The claim amendments made in the earlier-filed response are presented in proper form. The remarks made in the earlier-filed response are repeated below.

In addition, the Examiner's attention is called to an IDS filed September 16, 2004. It appears the references cited in that IDS have not been considered. Consideration of the references listed in that IDS filing is respectfully requested.

Claims 17, 19-22, and 24 are pending.

Objections were raised against claims 18-22, 24, and 25.

Claims 17-20, 23-25 were rejected for obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 4 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,750.

Claims 17, 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by Ohran, U.S. Patent WO 98/20419.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 21 and 22 are deemed to recite allowable subject matter.

Though the Office action summary page indicates that claims 18-20 and 24 were rejected, it was confirmed with the Examiner during a telephone discussion conducted on January 27, 2005 that there are no art rejections for claims 18-20 and 24, and so these claims are also believed to recite allowable subject matter.

Appl. No. 10/657,010
Amdt. sent March 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2005

PATENT

Independent claim 17 and its dependent claims 18-22

Claim 18 depends from claim 17. For the reason set forth above, claim 18 is believed to recite allowable subject matter. Claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 18. Claim 18 has been canceled without prejudice. Claim 17 is believed to be allowable. The dependency of claims 19 and 21 have been amended accordingly.

Claims 19-22 have been amended to address the objection.

Claims 17 and 19-22 are believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 23 and its dependent claims 24 and 25

Claim 24 depends from claim 23. For the reason set forth above, claim 24 is believed to recite allowable subject matter. Claim 24 has been rewritten to incorporate the subject matter of claims 23. Claims 23 and 25 have been canceled without prejudice. Claim 24 is believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,


George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:cmm
60448426 v1